`DEC-03-2003 11:09

HP LEGAL CORVALLIS

1 541 715 8581 P.07/08

10982031-1

Patent Application 09/702,185

Remarks

Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

5 Claims 17, 21-27, 30, 32, and 50-57 are pending.

Claims 17 and 27 have been amended to to describe the cationic polyelectrolyte as "being from 2000 to 10,000 weight average molecular weight". This is a range within the range given on page 19, example 2. No new matter has been added.

10

1.5

20

Claims 17, 21-27, 30, 32, 50-57 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Furthermore, claims 17, 21-27, 30, 32, and 50-57 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. With the Declaration under Rule 132 signed by the inventor explaining why it is known that the molecular weight given is weight average molecular weight along with the amendments made in this response to the Advisory Action of September 12, 2003 and the previous response to the Office Action of June 26, 2003, the Examiner's objections heretofore should now be overcome.

Claims 17, 23-27, 32, 52-55, and 57 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kurabayashi et al. or Takahashi et al., either of which in

25

view of Watanabe et al..

Combining Kurabayashi or Takahashi with Watanabe would neither suggest nor make obvious the presently claimed invention. In the presently claimed invention, the quaternary ammonium compounds disclosed in both Kurabayashi and Takahashi are 1000 MW or less and are therefore distinguishably different than the larger cationic polyelectrolytes such as quaternary ammonium, having a weight average MW of from 2000 to 10,000 of the presently claimed invention.

DEC-03-2003 11:09

HP LEGAL CORVALLIS

1 541 715 8581

P.08/08

10982031-1

7

Patent Application 09/702,185

On the basis of the above amendments and arguments, the 103(a) rejection of 17, 23-27, 32, 52-55 and 57 based on Kurabayashi or Takahashi in view of Watanabe should be withdrawn.

In light of the above amendments and arguments, applicants respectfully request that the §§ 112 and 103(a) rejections be withdrawn.

A prompt and positive response is respectfully requested.

10

Hewlett-Packard Company 1000 NE Circle Blvd. m/s 422B Corvallis, OR 97330 Tele (541) 715-0159

Fax (541) 715-8581

Respectfully Submitted,

Shirley Lee et al.

W. Bradley Haymond Reg No. 35,186

Attorney for Applicants